

Faculty Senate

[Faculty Senate](#) » [Committees/Councils](#) » [Academic Standing Committee](#) » [Annual Reports](#) » Annual Report 2002-2003

Academic Standing Committee

Annual Report 2002-2003

Over the course of the 2002/03 academic year, 494 undergraduates were academically suspended from the University, in accordance with AR22. The Academic Standing Committee saw **101** students for Request for Reinstatement by Exception. Of this amount, 92 were reinstated to the University and nine (9) were denied. It should be noted that not all requests for exception in 2002/03 were those students who were suspended in that year. Each term the committee may see students wishing to seek exception that were suspended in prior years. Spring term experiences the most suspensions (256), with first-year students suffering the most (136).

The committee experienced a number of requests this year, that did not meet all four of the "conditions" outlined in Guideline #7. We will be sending a notice to the head advisors asking them to carefully review requests for reinstatement by exception to make sure they meet the conditions of the policy guidelines of the Academic Standing Committee. The "extraordinary circumstances" were either lacking entirely from some requests, to being pretty "un-extraordinary" by the committee's standards. Much of this leniency this past year, particularly in the summer months, was due to the Academic Passport pilot program implemented at the end of Spring term. The Academic Passport's intent is to provide an academic support program, in the form of a three credit class graded A-F for students who were suspended. Complete details of the pilot program, it's origin, intent, process and status can be obtained from Moira Dempsey in the Writing and Learning Center.

As a result of the introduction of the Academic Passport pilot program, an increased number of students sought reinstatement by exception. In Summer '02 there were three (3) hearings in June which saw a total of 14 students. This summer, the committee held six hearings in June and July and saw approximately 32 students. The committee believes this pilot program brought many students to ASC hearings, who normally would not be seen by the committee, as they truly didn't meet the four requirements of the appeal process. While the Academic Standing Committee wants to be as supportive as possible to the students, and to their advisors who assist them, the committee requests that all be aware of, and work within, the guidelines and regulations of the University and the Academic Standing Committee.

It is our understanding that the Academic Passport pilot program will conclude at the end of winter term and be assessed during spring term. Providing the assessment proves the program successful, it is the committee's recommendation to the administration that the Academic Passport program be fully funded and implemented to students on "academic probation" in the future. The Academic Passport program should be used as a preventative measure – before the student is suspended.

The committee felt the Request for Reinstatement by Exception process was compromised this summer when four students were administratively reinstated, without complete reinstatement request packets and documentation. The committee also felt there was a conflict of interest whereas the administrator reinstating the students had supervisory authority over the consultant who worked with the students on coming forward with their requests.

The committee also addressed issues relating to committee membership. The current membership would like the Committee on Committees to incorporate something in the volunteer sheet the time commitment and time of year that meetings are held. We found that our nine-month faculty members had a hardship in attending summer meetings, which were outside their contract dates, and this put the committee at hardship as well in numbers in attendance for hearings (not to the fault of the faculty). The ASC would like to recommend the announcement for FS committee membership include time commitment and meeting requirements. The ASC has an incredible time commitment and meets outside the nine-month contract period. It should also be noted that faculty on grants may not be able to serve due to their funding. We ran into both of these issues this year and the way the committee announcements are currently, there's nothing

that notes time commitment, etc. on them (to our knowledge).

The 2002-03 committee ran out of time to review the Standing Rules and Guidelines, but was recommended to be the first thing the 2003-04 committee tackle. Revisions should be seen at a fall Faculty Senate meeting.

Submitted by 2002-03 Academic Standing Committee

Debbie Bird McCubbin, Chair

Head Advisor, College of Forestry

| [Home](#) | [Agendas](#) | [Bylaws](#) | [Committees](#) | [Elections](#) | [Faculty Forum Papers](#) | [Handbook](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Membership/Attendance](#) | [Minutes](#) |

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344

[Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback](#)

[Copyright](#) © 2008 Oregon State University | [Disclaimer](#)

Valid [xhtml](#).